

CITY OF BELMONT

PLANNING COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2006 7:00 PM.

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Parsons, Wozniak, Mercer, McKenzie, Mayer, Frautschi

Commissioners Absent: Horton

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), Associate Planner Walker (AP), Zoning Technician Rob Gill (ZT), Acting City Attorney Noeske (ACA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS).

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS: None

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments): None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

4A. Action Minutes of July 5, 2006

Commissioner Mercer asked that the motion regarding the Minutes of June 7, 2006 be corrected to show that they were approved as “revised” rather than as “presented.”

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner Mercer, to accept the Action Minutes of Tuesday, July 5, 2006 as revised.

Ayes: Wozniak, Mercer, Mayer, Parson,

Noes: None

Abstain: Frautschi, McKenzie

Absent: Horton

Motion passed 6/0/1

5. OLD BUSINESS

5A. Request for Extension of Approval – 3401 Beresford Avenue

CDD de Melo summarized the staff report, stating that staff believes findings can be made in the affirmative and recommended approval of the extension.

Responding to Commissioner Frautschi’s questions, CDD de Melo stated that another neighborhood outreach is not required when an applicant applies for an extension, and that the status of the project next door does not affect the granting of this extension. Regarding the applicant’s request that the fees paid for the extension be applied to their building permit, CDD de Melo stated that that is out of the purview of staff or even the City Council. The City sets its development fees for all application types and this type of request would

require generation of a staff report and placing it on the agenda. Since the City is in a mode of attempting to have full cost recovery for its actions and in most cases does not collect enough fees to cover time spent, it is pretty clear that staff is unable to grant this request and it is not under the Commission's purview as part of its review of the extension.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to adopt the Resolution approving an extension for a single family design review for 3401 Beresford Avenue (Appl. No. 2005-0010) with Conditions of Project Approval appended.

Ayes: Frautschi, McKenzie, Mayer, Mercer, Wozniak, Parsons

Noes: None

Absent: Horton

Motion passed 6/0/1

CDD de Melo confirmed that this action is not appealable and the extension will take the applicant to July 5, 2007 with the full standard fees that were paid for the request for extension.

5B. Final Landscape/Irrigation Plan – 2609 Coronet Boulevard

AP Walker summarized the staff memo, recommending approval of the Landscape/Irrigation Plan and the Retaining Wall plan as proposed, and answered questions from the Commission. She added that an extension of the irrigation plan into the front lawn area will be required before building permit approval. Responding to Commissioner Mercer's question, the height of the retaining wall at the front of the house is 6', and gets smaller closer to the front property line; it may be 4 or 5' at the proposed steps. AP Walker stated that the retaining wall is proposed to be rough stucco painted a sage color. Commissioner McKenzie suggested that the color green might accentuate seeing the retaining wall.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the applicant is the original owner of the property. AP Walker believed the current owner's father lived there previously.

Commissioner Frautschi stated that he would abstain from voting on this project as he was absent when the original plans were approved. Regarding the landscape plan, he felt that the proposed Bay Laurel trees would not do well, felt that the linear look of the front could be improved, that the 6' retaining wall by the house needed softening, and that there was little irrigation in one area.

Commissioner Mercer questioned the necessity for the metal handrail next to the sidewalk on top of the retaining wall. Building Official Nolfi responded that if the elevation is 30" or greater it requires a guardrail, and if there are four or more risers it requires a handrail. These requirements apply to changes in elevation and stairs that are on or about the house. Commissioner Mercer asked for clarification of the use of the stretch down the street in front of the retaining wall; she would like to see plantings there rather than grass so that it couldn't be parked on. She agreed that another species of tree than the Bay Laurel would contribute more to the landscape. She also encouraged the applicant to use a stone or masonry face rather than stucco.

Commissioner Wozniak agreed that the plantings are unimaginative and would like to see a different kind of tree.

Commissioner Mayer agreed that the flat area in the front should have another surface rather than lawn.

Chair Parsons had the following comments and unanswered questions on the drawings: How big is the lawn in the front? Where does the ground cover and lawn meet? What happens between the retaining wall and the steps alongside the driveway? It looks like 2' of dirt and no sprinkler systems and no plantings are identified. The sidewalk comes down to what is soon-to-be dead grass because there are no sprinklers and no sidewalk down there. He did not understand why the retaining wall system works the way it does. The property out to the road needs to be sprinklered. More definition is needed on what the planting beds are going to have in them and how they are shaped. He felt that more details need to be worked out and that it is not an adequate drawing.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner Frautschi, to continue the Landscape/Irrigation Plan for 2609 Coronet Boulevard (Appl. No. 2005-0053), and ask the applicant to resubmit drawings answering the questions about the discrepancy in grade of the front walkway vs. the retaining wall, the irrigation in the 15' space at the curb, reconsider the species of tree on the front lawn, clarification of the lawn and shrubs, closer examination of the staircase on the right-hand side of the driveway and the one on the left, plantings on the left side of the driveway rather than just grass to mitigate the height of the wall at the stairway, and a grading plan that would show the top and bottom of the wall heights.

Ayes: Mercer, Frautschi, Mayer, McKenzie, Wozniak, Parsons

Noes: None

Absent: Horton

Motion passed 6/0/1

5C. Final Landscape/Irrigation Plan – 2828 San Juan Boulevard

AP Walker summarized the staff report, recommending approval of the Landscape/Irrigation Plan and the Retaining Wall Plan and adoption of the resolution.

Chair Parsons asked what will be under the trees. AP Walker stated that it would be mulch and a natural material.

Commissioner Mercer said she had spoken to AP Walker about the following concerns, which have been incorporated into the plan: 1) the irrigation will not extend to the Oak trees; 2) no Lantana under the Oak trees as they would require irrigation; 3) the rise of the crushed granite walkway, which would be unsafe as it was on a slope. The 16 steps clustered up near the house are in fact steps spread along the length of the walkway such that the crushed gravel is always level and not at a slope; 4) the back Oak tree that is 2' from the retaining wall will be moved at least 10' away from the wall. She believes one of the conditions is that the arborist will work with the applicant as construction progresses to make sure that the Oaks are tended to.

Commissioner Mayer was concerned that the ground cover in the front next to the driveway is not very attractive and will go into a weed. He thinks there should be mulch or some kind of treatment there.

Chair Parsons concurred about the stairs on grade and the need for mulch next to the driveway. He added that he was surprised to notice that the property is for sale as a developable lot.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wozniak, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to adopt the resolution approving a Final Landscape and Irrigation Plan for 2828 San Juan Blvd. (Appl. No. 2005-0070), with all of the existing conditions, the addition of a ground cover by the trees, movement of the Oak tree, reworking the walkway and no irrigation close to the Oaks.

Ayes: Wozniak, McKenzie, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons

Abstain: Frautschi

Absent: Horton

Motion passed 5/1/1

5D. Review of Notre Dame Avenue Frontage Landscape Plan – Notre Dame High School – 1540 Ralston Avenue.

Commissioner Frautschi recused himself and left the room as he lives within 300' of the subject property.

CDD de Melo summarized the staff memorandum, recommending approval of the proposed Landscape Plan, and adding that Arborists Walter Levison and Ralph Osterling, representing the school, are of a similar mindset as to what should be done for this area.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the plan is related to a general screening plan between the two sides of Notre Dame or is it simply a plan for tree trimming and replanting. CDD de Melo described the background of the project, concluding that a concern that was raised by the neighbors was the desire to create some measure of screening to screen the activities of the school from the neighboring properties to the west. Commissioner Mayer asked if the neighbors have approved of the degree of screening that is being created. CDD de Melo stated that some of the neighbors were in the audience and are available to comment.

Commissioner Mayer mentioned that something needs to be done in an area not shown on the plans, in front of the gate that leads to the Notre Dame gymnasium.

Commissioner McKenzie asked if the pathway that was in dispute at one time is now a public access pathway. CDD de Melo responded that it is actually private property, but the resolution approved in the year 2000 with the gymnasium project had a specific finding that this pathway was to be maintained for public access.

Commissioner Wozniak asked what species of trees are proposed for the parking lot between the front of the gym and the landscaping being proposed. CDD de Melo deferred the question to Mr. Osterling. She also asked if the Pittosporums are being irrigated.

Ralph Osterling, consulting arborist of 1650 Borel Place in San Mateo and also a Planning Commissioner for the City of Burlingame, stated that the working relationship with the City's arborist and CDD de Melo has been very productive, and felt that they are all on the same page. He questioned the suggestion for 24" box Redwood and recommended that they plant two Oak Trees so that that whole side of Notre Dame Avenue is a solid row of Oaks. He felt that Redwood over time will overtop the Oaks and they don't need height, they need the lower sightline breakage. Oaks would give a more consistent look and would be better for the turf on the playing field. Regarding the irrigation of the Pittosporum, there was a maintenance problem which has been corrected and they are now taking off like they are supposed to. The trees in the parking lot are Chinese Elm and are doing very well.

Mr. Osterling mentioned that Ficus has been planted on the fence and is doing very well. It will be a vine-covered fence and Oaks where they are well taken care of and will grow quite rapidly. He would expect they will grow at least 2 to 3 feet a year and probably more later on. He confirmed that the trees will be irrigated with a bubbler system which will be turned off when the Pittosporum get to a certain age.

Rita Gleason, Principal from Notre Dame High School, apologized to the neighbors because there was not a chance for them to see more of the information provided by CDD de Melo on Thursday.

Jonathan Penn, neighbor on Notre Dame Avenue, mentioned that there are trees he assumes are marked for removal that do not seem to match up with the memo he has from the July 18th meeting. There are some Plum trees that were going to be retained that are marked. He would like to see a solid row of Oaks but he does not see that in the Plan. This Plan shows removal of 23 trees with the addition of 9, which he felt would be a pretty big loss. He questioned the area just north of the gate that was cleared off over a month ago but remains barren. He does not see evidence of things being well taken care of on the path. He and his neighbors would like to see a timeline or diagram for when and where new trees are going to be situated.

Debbie Norton, neighbor on Robin Whipple Way, thanked Rita Gleason for working with the neighborhood for the last couple of years and for her apology about the last minute notice. She feels there needs to be a better process so that neighbors are notified in writing; they've worked very hard and want to make sure it looks nice. She believes the neighbors should be able to make suggestions, such as black paper under the ground cover to prevent weeds. She would like to see the bollards in the parking lot taken down or screened and would like to see some screening from the Oaks in the next 5-7 years.

Responding to Commissioner Wozniak's question about the notification process, CDD de Melo explained that staff reacted fairly quickly to the issues that were transpiring relative to the tree trimming and trees to be removed. He stated that they quickly got the Arborists together to come to some sort of concurrence about a game plan moving forward to have some of these trees removed as well as have a reforestation of that area. There was not a requirement for a 10-day notification process and he had some concerns because he was going to be out of the office for the 8/15 meeting and there would be a 3-week layoff between the next meeting, which would be September 5th. If there is more time needed to have this fully vetted by the neighborhood group, staff did not have a concern with that.

Commissioner Mayer felt that this was a good starting point and that there should be some sort of process whereby the residents of that area have a chance to vet this Plan and come in with some of their own ideas and that the corner lot that has been leveled should be addressed as part of this Plan. He added that it was puzzling to him that after all this time there is so little screening in place; something more dramatic could have happened by now, and it is important for the school to take the neighborhood seriously and for the neighbors to be involved in this process.

CDD de Melo provided some additional background about the section of property that fronts the high school. He explained that when the gymnasium and athletic field modifications were approved in 2000, the approved Landscape Plan as reviewed recommended removal of some of those trees because they were affected by the Dutch Elm disease, so some of them had been removed, which created a dramatic effect. The applicant did replace and install all landscaping that had been required as part of that gymnasium project and now certain numbers and species of the landscaping has died -- that was one of the issues raised in January 2004. The high school took steps to address those operational conditions as well as the physical improvements by replanting within the parking lot, along the edge of the gymnasium as well as areas within the walkway area; they were meeting the obligations of their planned development for the gymnasium.

Commissioner Wozniak agreed that the neighbors need to be involved in the process even if it takes continuing of this item, and that it would be good if the applicant could provide a couple of different ways to get response and feedback from the neighbors. The problem has been between the neighbors and the school. She suggested that there might be a place here for practicing defensive landscaping and

using some really quick-growing species interplanted to get the screen up that would be removed after things grow up. She commented that the side of the gym on Notre Dame Avenue looks like a big parking lot or rail yard, and her pet peeve is that the front of the gym facing Ralston is lit up like a Christmas tree all the time. She added that they need to assure that contractors adhere to the work hours and noise ordinances in Belmont. She feels there is room for a couple of Redwoods here and there and would like to see more shrubs planted along the fence.

Commissioner Mercer concurred that they want the neighbors involved in this and was not prepared to approve the Plan without input of the neighbors. She shared the concern about screening and thinks the neighbors might have some ideas as well. She stated that a complete row of Oak trees would be terrific up on the hills where the Oaks are native, but that there are many stunning specimens of Redwood trees in the valley, where the soil is richer and moister than up on the hills. She wants to keep planting tall conifers and Redwoods in this area closer to Ralston Avenue where the Oaks were lost during storms and flooding. She would like to see maybe two clusters of Redwood groves interspersed as a long-term diversified investment. She suggested that if they plant an entire row of Oaks and one day they catch Sudden Oak Death disease, then they've lost the whole row. Because these are tall trees, she would like to see some shrubs sprinkled throughout that would provide a low screening. She concurred that the area across the driveway just off of the plans needs to be included and suggested that a couple of Redwoods would be great there.

Commissioner McKenzie would like to see the end result of this in a clear definitive plan, not an arborist's marked up recommendation on a five-year-old landscape plan, so that they can see what the ground cover is that's recommended, where the mulching areas are and how it all plays together. It needs to be definitive. CDD de Melo stated that that's one of the reasons they asked for the matrix in the arborist's report, which describes the trees to be retained, the trees to be trimmed and the trees to be planted. Commissioner McKenzie responded that a matrix does not give you a vision of what it might look like.

Chair Parsons congratulated the school for continuing their effort to try to be good neighbors. He suggested that the Ms. Gleason make the Plan available in her office for the neighbors to see it at their convenience. He agreed that a much clearer drawing needs to be prepared, and that it would be nice to see the landscaping on both sides of the gate. He agreed that putting some Redwoods in, especially the wet areas, was a good point, and possibly where they need to be screened where the high nets are so ugly.

CDD de Melo summarized the discussion as follows:

- First and foremost is a meeting with the neighbors to discuss the plan.
- The neighbors can start to make their comments and then, based upon their comments, staff could have some ideas relative to the two clusters of the redwood groves, having a variety of interspersed plantings, some low visual shrubs, including the area north of the driveway, having a fully executed landscape plan.
- The school has their direction to move forward and staff will also work with them as well.
- They could begin with minor tree trimming as long as they don't remove the trees yet that are slated to come out.

Chair Parsons added that there should be a comment in the next report that the Commission suggested that the City do something about improving the drainage along the street side. He also asked that the neighbors make it a point to see what is being proposed and make their input known so that everybody is involved. The school is making an effort; now it's up to the neighbors to participate.

MOTION: By Chair Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Wozniak, to continue to a date uncertain the Notre Dame Avenue frontage Landscape/Tree Removal Plan for Notre Dame High School at 1540 Ralston Avenue.

Ayes: Parsons, Wozniak, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer

Recused: Frautschi

Absent: Horton

Motion passed 5/1/1

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

6A. PUBLIC HEARING – 1301 Shoreway Road

To consider a Design Review for establishment of a Master Sign Program to permit new signage for an existing multi-tenant office building (Appl. No. 2006-0008)

APN: 040-371-110; Zoned M-1 (Limited Manufacturing) CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303 Applicant: Annette Tognetti, Specialized Graphics Owner: ECI Two Belmont LLC

ZT Gill summarized the staff report, recommending approval with the conditions of approval attached.

Commissioner Mayer asked how the free-standing directional sign can be placed to conform to the code.

ZT Gill and CDD de Melo explained the requirements of Sections 23.6.6, 23.4.2 and 23.5 and how they were applied to this application.

Commissioner Mayer noted that they used the plural word “signs” for the wall signs, and asked where they would be located and how big they would be. ZT Gill responded that the building projects forward a bit so one sign would be on the left-hand side and the other would be to the right of the adjacent entryway at the top floor, both facing 101 viewed from Shoreway Road. They would both be the name of the primary tenant. If there was a second tenant there would be another one. CDD de Melo interjected that they are well under their limits for total signage for that site based on both street linear frontages.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.

Commissioner Frautschi complimented the applicant on the maintenance of his site.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving the Design Review at 1301 Shoreway Road (Appl. No. PA 2006-0024), with appended Exhibit A, Conditions of Project Approval for Sign and Design Review, with the addition of a condition excluding the directional sign.

Ayes: Frautschi, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer, Wozniak, Parsons

Absent: Horton

Motion Passed: 6/0/1

This item may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

7. REPORTS, STUDIES & CODE ENFORCEMENT UPDATES

7A. Charles Armstrong School (CAS) – 1405 Solana Drive

Commissioner Wozniak recused herself from participating in this discussion because she lives within 300’ of the property, and Commissioner Mayer recused himself because of his involvement with the issues that are at stake.

CDD de Melo summarized the staff memorandum and its attachments. He added that staff had received an email that day from Commissioner Wozniak as well as a letter from Commissioner Mayer. Hard copies of both were provided to the Commission.

Commissioner Frautschi asked to see a copy of what CAS provides parents regarding traffic, parking and carpool information that is referred to in item b. of page 2 of Attachment B, as well as the communication document the school provides parents at the beginning of the school year mentioned in the same paragraph. He also asked for an update on the Landscape Plan, which he calculated is to begin August 18th, and for a copy of the contract with the gardener. Regarding overflow parking, he wanted to know how many over-parking events they are predicting for the rest of the year. Referring to item d on page 2, violations of the mandatory drop-off regulations, he questioned how they will handle a parent who is not caught on the day of a violation. I.e., if it comes to their attention at a later time, will they handle it in the same way? He also asked what they envision with respect to limited weekend access of their professional team, as mentioned in the next to last paragraph of their letter of July 25th. He thanked staff for the summary of the status of the original code enforcement issues, and was glad to see that progress was being made, however, a letter received from Ms. Wozniak, President of the Homeowners Association, states that there are still a number of areas where things seem to be happening, particularly for the days of operation.

Carol Beattie, member of the Board of Trustees of Charles Armstrong School and co-chair of the Compliance Committee for Neighborhood Relations, responded as follows:

- Debbie Hillbahn will provide the documents given to parents when she returns from vacation. • She had not yet received the Notice of Action but knew that Bryan from Calendar Associates took the recommendations as well as the suggestions and incorporated those into his plan. CDD de Melo noted that staff is putting the Notice and cover letter together and wants to meet with the school in advance of his week vacation.

- Ms. Beattie stated that the next step will be to meet with CDD de Melo before his vacation.

- They can provide samples of contracts with the gardener via the internet and CDD de Melo will transmit this to the Commission.

- Regarding the over-flow parking, the calendar for September 1st will address when the events are taking place. She added that there are no weekend events, no events outside of the 9:00 timeframe, and most of their events are pushed up to finish at 8:30.

- Regarding the drop-off regulation, staff stands outside in the morning as parents are coming in to insure that people are flowing into the parking lot, and not dropping children off. If someone is caught, it is handled on a case-by-case basis. If they get feedback, they do follow up with a Non Compliant Report form with a copy to the parent, Debbie and the student's file. She added that they've not gotten to the point where they've had to handle a violation reported by a parent and not witnessed by staff. They look for feedback and handle it in a way that fits the school's goals.

- Her intentions in the last two sentences of the paragraph were written primarily to provide feedback in terms of the positive and the negative, and cited instances where staff members needed to return to the school on the weekend, a new teacher dropped off some boxes unaware that he would set off an alarm, and calls from parents that require information that is at the school. CDD de Melo confirmed that the CUP does not allow that kind of activity – the school is supposed to be dark after 9 p.m. and on weekends. On a practical side he would think that if one needs to just drive in to pick up an inhaler, who is that going to harm, but if that turns into staying 4 hours to do some work it becomes a problem. He feels that the Green Screen will come to some productive discussions about the McDougal park use and maybe at the same time the school may ask the same questions about the strict weekend use of the facility. Ms. Beattie added that what they are missing in this report is that when they do have a violation they log that violation so that CDD de Melo can see why it is they are coming up with a remedy.

- Commissioner McKenzie asked if weekend access is the only condition that they consider a hardship. Ms. Beattie stated that it is from curriculum and professional standpoints. Commissioner McKenzie felt that it is an unrealistic requirement but nevertheless it is a condition and a requirement, and he thought it would be constructive to see what they would propose for limited access. He asked CDD de Melo if it can be done or if it is out of the question. CDD de Melo responded that anyone who is operating under a conditional use permit has that opportunity. They would have to make an application to the City to be reviewed by the Planning Commission, and it would be fully vetted at a public hearing. Ms. Beattie asked for another three months to continue on the current path before attempting to change it.

Chris Wozniak, neighbor across the street from the school, appreciated the efforts that have been made after 20 years of virtually non-compliance with all of their CUPs. She felt they have made a tremendous effort and stated that just closing the upper parking lot most nights, turning off their lights at 9 p.m. and removing the benches and tables from in front of the school has really made a difference in her life – kids don't hang out there on weekends anymore. She stated that one thing that is missing from the report is that no neighbors were asked to respond at this meeting, and she was concerned because she read in the newspaper that the permit revocation process was cancelled. She stated that that is really not as she understands what's happening; this is an on-going thing because a permit can be revoked at any time. She would like to see more neighborhood feedback when the reports come through instead of a report that's essentially one sided. The discussion about changing the CUP is not a minor issue; the school made an agreement with the neighborhood and these conditions were all part of the approval. The neighbors made an agreement to live with the school during the week and would like to have their neighborhood back on the weekends.

CDD de Melo made a point for clarification. This school is always on probation and in terms of the wording of how staff described the actions taken within the last six months, the Commission discontinued the pursuit of the revocation, citing progress, but they can reopen that revocation hearing at anytime. He had received a call from a reporter and directed him to the staff memos that had been prepared.

Chair Parsons stated for the record that he also took a call from the reporter and had referred him to CDD de Melo; he had made a few comments but in no terms said that they had cancelled the revocation hearing. CDD de Melo added that it is never cancelled, it is postponed.

7B. Motel 6 – 1101 Shoreway (Verbal update)

CDD de Melo stated that he is having discussions with Chief of Police Mattei, and has a meeting scheduled with Motel 6 representatives regarding some minor window changes for the building. At that time will take the opportunity to get their feedback about how they think things are transpiring with the code compliance issues. Chair Parsons added that their landscape is not being maintained and reminded about the issue of requiring guests to check out after a 30-day stay.

7C. Safeway—1100 El Camino Real (Verbal update)

CDD de Melo said he placed calls to Safeway on the tree grate popping issue but has not yet had a response. He hopes he can provide that update at the next meeting.

7D. Chuck's Donuts – 641 Ralston Avenue (Verbal update)

CDD de Melo stated that they are heading towards litigation on that property. Commissioner Mercer asked who is responsible for the foot-high weeds in front of the property around the Sam Trans bench. CDD de Melo responded that if it is in the public right of way it would be the City's responsibility.

8E. \$1.75/\$2.50 Cleaners – 678 Ralston Avenue (Verbal update)

CDD de Melo cited the new Administrative Code Enforcement Ordinance where they have a better opportunity to give citations for non-compliant properties. Consistent with that ordinance, a friendly courtesy letter about their violation has been sent for this property. A plan for a sign permit was due on July 28th but was not performed; they now have an additional 7 days to submit for that permit, so that if there is no sign permit applied for by August 7th the City can start fining up to \$200 per day for the first day, \$300 the second day and \$500 each day after that.

Chair Parsons reminded staff that the dirt still has not been pushed away from the trees on the three lots on Ralston and Pullman. CDD de Melo stated that he has taken that issue to Public Works three times.

Chair Parsons said that it appears that 6 or 7 of the Redwoods and many of the Heavenly Bamboo in the median on Ralston west of Cipriani is dying.

Commissioner McKenzie asked what has happened to the Chevron station. CDD de Melo said that Bohannon Corp., owner of the property, has no plans for development at this time; they only took out a permit for demolishing the service station. They removed all structures from the site. Responding to concerns about environmental issues, Building Official Nolfi stated that they were required to get approval from San Mateo County Environmental Health.

Commissioner Frautschi asked if an administrative permit had been given to the Yaseen Foundation to redo their building. CDD de Melo responded that they were granted an interior renovations plan but not for exterior changes to the building. Commissioner Frautschi said that the windows are cut. Staff will research that issue.

Commissioner Frautschi referred staff to a large Oak tree at a newly constructed house on 6th Avenue and Harbor that is dying. He believes a condition of approval was that it had to survive a certain amount of time after the house was finished. Staff will follow up.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 2006.

Liaison: Commissioner Mercer

Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Frautschi

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, August 15, 2006, at 7:00 pm at Belmont City Hall.

Carlos de Melo

Planning Commission Secretary

CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the

Community Development Department.

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.